REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, applicant requests acknowledgment of the claim for priority and receipt of certified copy of the priority document filed with this application.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under §102(e) on the basis of Zisapel et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, because the cited reference does not disclose (or suggest) at least the claimed notification means for notifying a router of the virtual IP address and the real IP address of each processor module as routing information.

Figure 3 and its corresponding description of the Zisapel et al. reference is cited in the Office Action as disclosing the claimed notification means. Figure 3 discloses a management system including a client 105 that has multiple connections to the Internet through multiple routers and corresponding Internet Service Providers (ISPs). The reference teaches that when the client 105 seeks to connect to a server 150 on the Internet, a polling process is performed to determine the first choice of a router and an ISP for connecting the client with the server (see col. 16, lines 1-21). The result of the polling is stored in a proximity table 155, which includes the IP address of the server and the best router through which the connection should be made (see Fig. 3D and col. 16, lines 22-28). When a new client 160 attempts to connect to the destination server with the same IP address recorded in the proximity table 155, a content router 145 determines from the proximity table the best router to use to connect to the destination server. Therefore, the Zisapel et al. reference teaches a content router 145 which identifies the best router through which to connect to the destination server.

In the present invention, the notification means of the multiple-processor information processing system notifies a router of the virtual IP address and the real IP address of a processor module within the processing system, itself, as routing information. In Zisapel et al. the content router of a system identifies the router to use to get to a destination server outside the system. Moreover, the content router of the cited reference provides only the real IP address of the destination server as the routing information, but not both the real IP address and the virtual IP address of the server, as in the present invention. For at least these reasons, claims 1-3 are allowable over the cited reference.

Moreover, as shown in Figs. 1 and 2, Zisapel et al. disclose a system for communicating between a plurality of server farms 10, 20 and a client 26. Figs. 3 to 5 of Zisapel et al. disclose that a client 105, 160, 170 communicates with a server through a plurality of connections such as ISPs, each having a respective router. This system basically differs from the multiple-processor information processing system including a plurality of processor modules as described in claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant believes that this case is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The examiner should call applicant's attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 

B. Joe Kim
Registration No. 41,895

October 12, 2005

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315
Customer No. 24978
P:\DOCS\0828\65511\991965.DOC